

Free Energy And Free Thinking

# Gravity Theories of Newt and Einy Debunked

by Robert Otey

# **My Second Free eBook:**

## **Gravity Theories of Newt and Einy Debunked by Robert Otey**

Robert Otey's work debunking the gravity myths (theories) of einstein and newton taught in academia as truth:

Here Robert dissects the many bizarre claims made by the modern astronomers who have proved that they have no idea at all about how the real Universe operates. Courtney Seligman taught this backwards psyence in college. Here Robert takes this psyence apart piece by piece using Walter Russell's Cosmology as a tool to debunk them. Robert's comments are titled "my response" after each claim made by Seligman. Comments will also be seen in parenthesis following incredulous remarks made by Seligman.

### **Part 1**

<http://www.cseligman.com/text/history/kepler.htm>

Kepler's 2nd so-called law!

The Second Law, called the Law of Areas because of the way it is stated, tells us how the planets move in their orbits — not in uniform, unchanging motions, requiring no force to motivate them, but in motions which are in a constant state of flux, or change, going faster as they approach the Sun, and slower as they move away from the Sun, with the implication that some force must be changing the motion of the planets. This is some ways the most important discovery that Kepler made. The fact that the orbits are ellipses, instead of some complicated combination of circles, is interesting, elegant, and to a mathematician, beautiful; but the fact that the motions change puts the lie to all previous theories of planetary motion. Unlike the stars, the planets do not move in unchanging, uniform motion, but in motion which goes faster and slower as they orbit the Sun; (hee hee hee) in motion which almost certainly requires some kind of force, most likely due to the Sun, to keep them moving in that way.

As already noted, the Third Law is not specifically required to solve the initial problem of planetary motion. But in some ways, it is the most beautiful of all,

for it shows that there is some deep force at work, which relates what happens to one planet to what happens to all of them; for if you know the relative sizes of two planets' orbits, their relative orbital periods and relative velocities are directly determined by the Third Law. The mathematical form of the relationship seemed to Kepler so beautiful — mathematically beautiful in the same way that a melody is musically beautiful — that he called it the Harmonic Law, music and mathematics are very closely related, both in the theory underlying musical forms, and in the way the human brain treats them, so that mathematical and musical ability often go hand in hand.

My response:

Pari Spolter's book "Gravitational Force of the Sun" says on page 226, "In the Summer the Earth weighs less than in the winter. Earth spins faster in the winter and slower in the summer.

My response:

The faster slower than about the Earth's rotation and the speeding up and slowing down than about so-called Earth orbits are explained by the illusions created in the helical trajectories of the planet in their relationships to one another, when framed by the false belief it is all happening on a nearly flat 2d plane!

<http://www.cseligman.com/text/history/kepler1.htm>

Since the ellipses used to describe planetary orbits are mathematical fictions which have no physical reality, their shape is of little importance; but the position of the Sun within an orbit is important, as it defines how much closer or further the planet can be at perihelion or aphelion, than on the average. This is expressed by the eccentricity, symbolized mathematically by the letter  $e$ , which is the variation in distance from the Sun as a fraction of the semi-major axis, but is often read as a percentage variation.

Note: Since all the orbits shown below have the same size = the same semi-major axis, the orbital periods would be the same; since the areas, perimeters and speeds of the objects following such different orbits would be different, this is a remarkable result.

<http://www.cseligman.com/text/history/kepler2.htm>

Close to the Sun, a given arc sweeps out a small area; further away, a larger

area. This means that it takes less time to cover a given arc close to the Sun, so the planet must be moving faster; and more time to cover a given arc further from the Sun, so the planet must be moving slower. In other words, the Law of Areas implies that as the planets move away from the Sun, they slow down; and as they move toward it, they speed up.

For small changes in distance (low-eccentricity orbits), the change in speed is about the same, in percentage terms, as the change in distance; that is, for each percent that a planet moves closer to the Sun it speeds up by about one percent, and for each percent that it moves away from the Sun it slows down by about one percent. As an example, as the Earth moves 1.7% closer to the Sun, in January, it speeds up by 1.7%, and as it moves 1.7% further from the Sun, in July, it slows down by 1.7%

For larger changes in distance, things are not so simple, except at perihelion and aphelion, where the motion is perpendicular to the radius vector; at those points, the speed is inversely proportional to the distance; so if an object were 10 times further from the Sun at aphelion than at perihelion, it would be going 10 times slower. For some comets, aphelion is as much as 100,000 times further out than perihelion, and although the comet moves nearly 200 miles per second at perihelion, at aphelion, going 100,000 times slower, it only moves about 10 feet per second, and takes 300 years to move as far as it would in one day, at perihelion.

This is because on the way in, the planet is speeding up, and on the way out, it is slowing down; and for every point on the inward journey where the planet has a particular speed, there is a symmetrical point on the outward journey where the planet has the same speed; so it covers the equal arcs at different speeds at different times, but with the same average speed, over the half-orbit shown above.

#### The Force Behind The Law: A Brief Note of Caution

The reason that the planets move this way is that the force which keeps them in their orbits points at the Sun. When they are moving away from the Sun, its pull is backwards and sideways relative to their direction of motion, so they slow down and curve toward the Sun. When they are moving toward the Sun, its pull is forward and sideways relative to their direction of motion, so they speed up and curve toward the Sun. Neither the nature of the force, its strength, or the way that its strength changes with distance can alter that statement. The Law of Areas would be true no matter what kind of force the Sun exerted on the planets, as long as that force pointed directly toward the Sun.

The force which the Sun exerts on the planets is the same as the gravitational

force which the Earth exerts on us; and is, as discovered by Isaac Newton, an inverse-square law, meaning that it gets weaker as the planet moves away from the Sun, and stronger as the planet moves toward the Sun. (electrical potential) Students often mistakenly presume or state that planets slow down as they move away from the Sun, because the Sun's force is getting weaker, with the implication that if they didn't go slower, its force couldn't hold onto them; and that planets speed up as they move toward the Sun, because the Sun's force is getting stronger, and a stronger force makes them go faster than a weaker one would. This sounds reasonable, but is a totally incorrect analysis of the Law of Areas. No matter how the Sun's force changed with distance — getting weaker as the inverse square of the distance, or in any other way; not changing; or even getting stronger — only the shape of the orbital motion would be affected. The Law of Areas would be completely unaffected, because all that depends on, as already stated, is that the force is backwards, slowing the planet down, as it moves outward; and is forwards, speeding the planet up, as it moves inward.

<http://www.cseligman.com/text/history/kepler3.htm>

#### THIS IS THE WAY THAT WE (WEIGH) THE UNIVERSE.

Things that (weigh more), have more (gravitational force) on them. But, according to Newton's Third (Law), Law of Action and Reaction, if more force is exerted on something, then (it exerts more force back) on 'you'. In the case of gravity, Jupiter has over 300 Earth masses. This means that the (Sun would have to pull on Jupiter over 300 times harder) than on the Earth, if they were in the same place, in order to move it the same amount, which it would do, willy or nilly, because gravity moves all things in the same way, regardless of their mass. But if the (Sun pulls on Jupiter 300+ times harder, Jupiter must pull back on the Sun 300+ times harder, and in fact, Jupiter must pull on EVERYTHING 300+ times harder than the Earth does), given the same distance between 'everything' and the Earth/Jupiter.

Example:

Moon going around the Earth

(semi-major axis)  $a = 250,000$  miles

(orbital period)  $P = 27 \frac{1}{3}$  days

Now, let's make each of these '1' unit

1-squared = 1-cubed is Kepler's 3rd Law

Io going around Jupiter

(semi-major axis)  $a$  = approx 250,000 miles

(orbital period)  $P$  = approx 1 1/2 days

18 times less than for our Moon, even though the orbit is the 'same' size.

The rotation of Jupiter is much faster than the Earth and this is the reason for the greater velocities of the moons around Jupiter. They were born from Jupiter with a much higher rotational centrifugance.

$(1/18)^2$  is NOT  $1^3$  BUT, put in the mass of Jupiter (approx 18-squared)

$(18)^2$  (times)  $(1/18)^2$  IS equal 1

That's how we know that Jupiter is over 300 Earth masses, and exerts over 300 Earth gravities on things at the 'same' distance.

Do the same thing with the Sun and Earth

(semi-major axis) = 400 times Moon's orbit

(orbital period) = 13 times Moon's orbit  $13^2$  NOT EQUAL  $400^3$

170 NOT EQUAL 64000000

BUT if the Sun is 333,000 Earth masses, THEN 333000 (times) 170 IS EQUAL TO 64000000

So, that's the mass of the Sun.

Kepler's so-called 3rd law

Somehow, (gravity knows) how hard to pull on things, to make them fall the same way, DESPITE their difference in mass.

If something has a small mass,  $m$ ,

weight = mass (times) acceleration of gravity

Small  $w$  = small  $m$  (times) constant of gravity

If something has a BIG mass,  $M$ ,

WEIGHT = MASS (times) acceleration of gravity

BIG  $W$  = BIG  $M$  (times) constant of gravity

Gravity is the (ONLY) force that works this way.

So, you can measure (the mass) of an object, by seeing (how much it weighs, Or by how (hard it pulls) on other objects.

My response:

Pari Spolter has proved empirically that the addition of mass or the product of two masses to be exact has nothing at all to do with so-called Universal Gravitation. Newton added these masses purely ad hoc and Kepler's Third Law explained the so-called effects of gravity (really electric potential)

without the introduction of the masses. The result of Newton's mistake has created a neurotic view of the Cosmos where masses pull on each other with more strength the larger the masses become and somehow know just how much "pull" to dole out to all bodies. This leads to the absurdity that planets and moons speed up and slow down according to how much pull is exerted upon them. There is no pulling force anywhere in our Universe, nor is gravitation a pulling force. Gravity is points and shafts of stillness, which centers all masses. The effects we see are due purely to electric potential.

#### Orbital Motion (Spring 2004)

In Greek physics, circular orbits are presumed to require no force — it is just the natural thing for planets to do, to follow a circular orbit. But in (Newtonian physics), objects which have no force on them move in (straight lines), at constant speed in other words, have constant velocity. So, to follow a circular orbit, some kind of force is required.

My response:

(the fundamental flaw here is newton's false assumption that objects move in "straight lines". Straight lines do not exist in the real Universe, all paths are curved. This false assumption forces a false meaning onto the observation of a circular path, requiring an additional force, when in fact the object is merely following the helical trajectory created with its origin, birthed from a mother body following the curvature and velocity of its rotation and forward progression around the galactic core. Rotation in Larger bodies further out from the Sun spin in their rotations much faster than smaller bodies closer to the Sun. Therefore, the velocity of the satellites born from the outer lanets will be much faster than the inner planets and has nothing to do with gravity "pulling harder" on them, because gravity is not even a pulling force. Gravity is stillness and electricity is the sole working force of Creation).

To find the force, we estimate the acceleration, the rate at which velocity changes. This requires some geometry to do accurately, but can be approximated by considering the change that occurs during half of an orbit.

At the start, the object is moving in some direction, at some velocity  $v$ . Half an orbit later, the object is on the other side of the orbit, moving in the opposite direction, at the same velocity. Hence the net change in velocity is  $2v$ , the difference between the velocity being one way or the other is twice the individual velocities.

This change of velocity occurs in half an orbit, which takes half an orbital period, or  $1/2 P$ . Therefore, the average rate of change of the velocity is

(total velocity change) / (time required)  
or  $2 v / (1/2 P) = 4 v / P$ .

Fluxions

Everything is in a state of flux (change) in an orbit

Distance is changing, speed is changing, and direction of motion is changing all the time

Differential calculus

Even for ellipses, force points at Sun (always), and is an inverse square force  
??? is the force ???

Apples are not pulled down by the Earth physically  
They just fall.

Gravity is a strange thing.

You can look at it many ways.

(RED FLAG!)

Greek:

Weight = desire to reach the ground

Falls = allow it to accomplish its desire.

Newton:

Fall = Earth pulls on them with a force = gravity

Weight = pull of the Earth on them

Strange force, because all things fall the same way

Force Law =>>  $F = m a$  (acceleration)

Different masses acted on by a given force will have different accelerations.

But gravity 'knows' that if something is harder to move (has more mass) it should be pulled on harder, has more weight! (RED FLAG, FAIL! )

$W = m g$  (mass times acceleration of gravity)

Fictitious Forces (GRAVITY)

'Fictitious' force is a force that appears to exist, but does not 'really' exist, because you are in an accelerated reference frame.

Newton has used Kepler's Laws, and his new math, fluxions, to find that (the force making the planets move around the Sun) points at the Sun, and is an

inverse square force  
 $F = \text{constant} / r\text{-squared}$

He (guesses that it is GRAVITY) that does this.

He has to justify and PROVE it, or nobody will believe him.  
(To justify it, he looks at the Moon), to see if it obeys Kepler's Laws.  
Things seemed to work just fine.

Moon has an elliptical orbit. It obeys the Law of Areas,

Start with physics → Law of Areas

(a) as you go out, you are (pulled backwards), so you slow down; as you come in, you are (pulled forwards), so you speed up. How much? Go through the math, and you get the Law of Areas.

3. Mass times P-squared = size – cubed

$W = mg$

More mass requires more force

(If the force in planetary motion is gravity), a pebble, a boulder, a moon, a planet should all ('fall') around the Sun the same.

My response:

(Planets and Moon have their own centers of gravity and do not fall toward the Sun or the planets which birthed them. They are held there by electric compression from without. They are spiraling away from their primaries, not falling towards them as claimed by astronomers)

So, at the orbit of Jupiter, Io, Jupiter's moon, should ('fall'), due to the Sun, the same as Jupiter, even though Jupiter is thousands of times heavier.

At the orbit of the Earth, our moon should ('fall') around the Sun the same as the Earth, even though the Earth is heavier.

My response:

(Once again, Planets and Moon have their own centers of gravity and do not fall toward the Sun or the planets which birthed them. In, fact, They are all expanding away from their primaries.)

In the text, where the Greek concept of 'uniform circular motion' is discussed,

ancient Greeks would have said, that such motion occurs because it is 'NATURAL' for the objects involved, celestial bodies, and NO FORCE is required.

My response:

(The Greeks were right! The path of the helical trajectory of a planet forms a circle not an ellipse if seen from the apex of the vortex where the Sun is located)

However, in Newtonian-Galilean physics, things go in (straight lines), with constant speed, if there is no force on them, Law of Inertia, or Newton's First Law.

My response:

(Newton was wrong, because straight lines do not exist in the real Universe and this is one of the foundational fallacies which sent academic science groping into the dark ages of theories based upon mathematics.)

Now, Newton has three (laws) of motion, first two are above. The Third (Law) called the (Law of Action and Reaction), says that the force acting on one body, due to another 'action', is equal and opposite to the force acting on the other body, due to the first one 'reaction'. Opposite in the sense that they are in opposite directions, and act on the opposite object.

So, if you push on a wall, it will push back on you, in the opposite direction, with the same force

My response:

(this shell game fallacy is that the wall pushes back on you, this is a lie, the wall is passive and receives a pushing force, it does not push back because it is motionless in relationship to the "pusher". The motion is being applied to it, it is not pushing back. This is a major logical fallacy, which has led to much delusion in academic science)

Or, if you tug on a rope, someone on the other end, if they resist, in any way, will automatically tug back on you, with an equal and opposite force.

My response:

(The academic shell game being played here is the use of a motionless source of a wall, being swapped for humans in a tug of war contest. There is a huge difference in these two analogies. They are implying that "if the wall resists in

“any way”, even though it is stationary and does not move or pull on the rope, means the wall pulls back, “with an equal and opposite force”. The shell game substitution here is this thought experiment swaps humans, which have the ability to pull against each other, with walls which do not, so that it appears a wall can pull back just like humans can!)

And in the case of the Earth-Moon system, this means that whatever force acts on the Moon, due to the Earth, the same force acts on the Earth, due to the Moon.

My response:

(there is no rope connecting the Moon to the Earth, they are not pulling on each other at all, the analogy using Newton’s so-called 3rd law, The (Law of action and reaction) is therefore invalid and has nothing to do with the processes which give the Earth and Moon the combined helical trajectories. These are conditions created by the electrical pressures which give these bodies their form and not an inward pulling gravity as hypothesized by newton).

The Earth is 81.6, approximately 80, or 100 times ‘heavier’ (more massive) than the Moon, so with THE SAME FORCE, the Earth moves 81.6 times less.

My response:

(The Earth and Moon are weightless, they float in Space. As Pari Spolter has shown the data regarding forces based on Newton’s gravitational equation is in fact false and Kepler’s third law, which requires no product of 2 masses at all in fact gives consistent sums. Area times acceleration is the true law here. Therefore the introduction of Mass by Newton has ruined the true understanding of the processes involved.)

The Moon goes around us, in an orbit approximately 24,

My response:

(approximately 24 what???, sent email to Courtney to find out what this misprint is actually trying to say)

the Earth moves 81.6 times less. The Moon goes around us, in an orbit approximately 240,000 miles in ‘radius’, at a speed of 2,000 miles per hour (27 1/3 days to go once around), and we go around in an ‘orbit’ 80 times slower, or only about 25 miles per hour, and in the same 27 1/3 days, only have time to cover an ‘orbit’ about 3,000 miles in ‘radius’ (80 times smaller).

We Each go around the center of mass, but the Moon moves in a path 80 times larger, 80 times faster, because the same force, acting on an object 80 times less massive, moves it 80 times more.

(I am waiting for a response from Courtney so I can address this fallacy since it is stated wrong and is missing vital information)

ALL FORCES WORK LIKE THIS. The amount of motion, or acceleration, that you get when you 'act' on an object, depends both on the force, and the inertia, or mass, of the object.

My response:

(Pari Spolter's work shows that "Mass" has nothing to do with this and Newton added it to his equation without any justification!)

EXCEPT FOR ONE FORCE — GRAVITY. ALL THINGS FALL THE SAME, UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF GRAVITY.

My response:

(planets and moons do not fall like cannon balls as Newton falsely claimed, they have their own centers of gravity and are spiraling away from the spheres which birthed them. They are not held together by an inward pulling force they are being compressed into their helical trajectories by the electric compression of the Sun's Cubic wave field and the eave field of each planet which birthed its Moons.)

Small thing,  $F = m$  (times) acceleration of gravity Big thing,  $F = M$  (times) acceleration of gravity

The acceleration of gravity is always the same. So, Not if something has a big, or small, mass, to make this work, (gravity has to exert more force on things which have more mass):

My response:

(Gravity is stillness which centers all heavenly bodies, there is no more of less so-called "gravity force" anywhere in the Universe! Stillness is stillness, the omnipresent "still magnetic light" that is, which is the same everywhere in the Universe. Also, the above premise is stated as a contradiction and logical fallacy! "The acceleration of gravity is always the same", yet it has to "exert more force on larger bodies"???)

(Electric potential is the key here to understanding the processes involved)

## FORCE LAW FOR GRAVITY

$W = m \text{ (times) } g$

Weight = mass (times) acceleration of gravity

Now, in Greek astronomy, everything goes around us, in some combination of uniform circular motions, because that's the 'natural' thing to do.

My response:

(and it agrees with Russell's Natural Science. There is only circular motion and ellipses are illusions due to our senses and Earth bound perspective)

Page 126 AS

5. No man, nor creating thing, can in the least way, become off-center from God, or can his orbit around God be aught, at any time, than a true circle, even though its seeming orbit is an ellipse. We think of orbits of planets as being elliptical. And so they seem, but such illusions in Nature are multitudinous, and must be overcome by comprehension. See Fig. 46

But in Newton-Galileo's physics, (straight-line motion) is the ('natural' thing), and if something goes round in a curve, there must be some kind of sideways force, acting on it.

My response:

(Straight lines are non-existent in the real Universe, so that they are not the "natural thing" they are in fact false and synthetic and have been falsely projected onto these observations, by those who memorize and repeat absurdities like straight lines of motion.)

For orbits, that is the force of gravity.

My response:

(No it is not, this is a misrepresentation of what is happening. Gravity is not a force. It is stillness which centers the spiraling electric motions which give form to every mass.)

Prior to Newton, it was presumed that gravity was a local phenomenon, on the Earth, and did not apply to things in space, which, being up in the heavens, were made of different stuff from the Earth, and behaved differently.

(After Newton), everything on the Earth, and in space, is presumed to follow the same (natural laws), and the motions we see, at least for the planets, are due to (gravitational forces) between them, and the Sun.

My response:

(The so-called "natural laws" are in fact false, based on logical fallacies and misrepresentations of the observed motions as I stated above! They are Earth bound observations and deductions based on the myth that the planets and

Moon falls towards their primaries like cannon balls fall to the Earth. These reduced motions of Newton's acceleration of "linear pulling, attractive force, gravity" are false to begin with, since objects do not fall according to the  $9.8 \text{ m/sec squared}$  formula of Newton. This is an illusion of a straight path downward for a falling object, whereas the true motions are helical arcs and the complete distances are not accurately represented in this equation and are rather reductions based upon the limitations of our senses to accurately perceive and record the true dynamic motions and distances of each fall. The distances are further due to the arcing of an object as it falls toward the Earth, which is rotating about 1000 miles an hour. The true dynamic motions and distances involved between heavenly bodies have been ignored by Newton in his child like simplification of these true motions)

Once again: the above should read: After Newton, everything on the Earth, and in space, is presumed to follow the same Newton created "natural laws", and the motions we see ( due to our Earth based Myopic vision), at least for the planets, are due to (gravitational forces) between them, and the Sun.

These "unnatural and false Earth bound Laws" created by Newton are in fact extrapolated to the rest of the Cosmos where they have failed miserably and created the psychotic notion that Gravity is more or less for every mass and therefore each mass pulls on all other masses with a different amount of force according to their weights. The latest data Pari Spolter has analyzed is indisputable proof that Newton was wrong and all of the tables of the astronomers are filled with endless piles of so-called data and calculations about the weights of heavenly bodies and their so-called gravitational pulls, based on this false extrapolation. Therefore the theories of astronomy are mostly false and have created a huge list of non-existent entities from the mathematics created by Newton, for example: big bang, black holes, dark energy, dark matter, Gravitational collapse, neutron stars, Machos, Wimps and Mond, to name a few.)

And, since the law of gravity on the Earth involves the mass of things, (bigger masses) requiring (bigger forces), this means that the law of gravity in space must also do so:

My response:

(Earth bound observations based on what is seen in an Earth centered gravity are not remotely the same as observations of other heavenly bodies, which have their own centers of gravity. Once again, the Planets and Moons are not falling towards their primaries, they are actually slowly spiraling away from them.)

Newton's Law of Universal Gravity

$F = m \text{ (time)} M \text{ (divided by)} r\text{-squared}$

The force (of gravity) is the product of the masses of the two objects, divided by the square of the distance between them, referred to as an inverse-square relationship,

My response:

(Pari Spolter proves empirically in her book, that mass has nothing to do with the Universal law of Gravity, Kepler's third law covers it without the introduction of masses into the equation. Pgs. 226, 143, 138, 131, 117, 112-113, 39-40, 18)

This discovery, that the force which makes the planets go around the Sun and the moons of the planets go around them, and later on, when binary stars are discovered, stars go around each other, and still later on, when galaxies are discovered, stars go around galaxies, depends upon the masses involved, changes Kepler's Third Law, to look like this:

My response:

(this is the fundamental flaw which has been extrapolated to the very ends of the Universe LOL! "Masses" were never needed to explain these motions, which are due to electrical causes not Earth bound gravity based causes and the resulting equations extrapolated and forced onto astronomical observations of an extremely different Nature. Once again, I repeat, these planets have no weight, they are floating weightlessly in space, end of story! The consequences of this massive failure are that we have unknown thousands of sets of data cataloging every heavenly body observed from Earth and space telescopes, which are false and have created an entire false systems of psience called astronomy and astro-physics)

My response:

(therefore the following claims are in fact also false!)

Kepler: Period-squared = size of orbit-cubed

Newton: Mass of system (times) P-squared = a-cubed

Now, for all things in the Solar System, the mass on the left is the mass of the Sun, plus the mass of the planet; and planets are very small, compared to the

Sun, so to better than 1/10th of 1% accuracy, this is always the same number, and you can ignore it, and get Kepler's version of this formula.

Example of how this works:

Moon takes  $27 \frac{1}{3}$  days, to go around the Earth. We will call this one 'unit' of orbital period.

Moon's orbit is 240,000 miles in 'radius'.

We will call this one 'unit' of orbital size.

My response:

( a radius is not an orbit in this case, it is the linear distance to the Moon, not the "spiral circumference" of its helical trajectory, therefore it is not a "unit of orbital size" it is a unit of "spiral distance" from the Earth, a linear distance as measured in a straight line from Earth, which is radically different than the curved path of the Moon's real trajectory and not a fraction of the true distance the Moon travels to complete one full spiral circumference, falsely called an orbit by academia. Orbits do not exist in the real Universe, because the forward dynamic motion on the z axis of both Earth and Moon is removed from this false concept!)

So, for our Moon, Kepler's 3rd Law = 1-squared = 1-cubed ( $1 = 1$ )

This works, (because we're 'cheating'), so to speak. (We're defining things, to work this way).

But now, let's do this for Io, a moon of Jupiter.

Io's orbit is about the same size as our Moon's orbit, so it is 1 unit, approximately.

My response:

(this is the falsely claimed radius to Io which I debunked above, with the false concept of one 'unit' of orbital size)

Io's orbital period is only about  $1 \frac{1}{2}$  days, or about 18 times less than for our Moon.

$\frac{1}{18}$  squared =  $\frac{1}{324}$  ? = ? 1-cubed = 1 ?

Of course not!

UNLESS YOU PUT IN THE MASS.

Earth + Moon = 1 unit of orbital size

Jupiter + Io = ? units

? times  $1/324 = 1$

JUPITER MUST 'WEIGH' 324 mores than Earth. The actual number is about 318

My response:

(Earth bound observations, calculations and deductions, which created the false ideas about masses and their so-called "gravitational pull" are here transferred to the Planet Jupiter to extend the fallacy out into the rest of the Cosmos. This is how all of astronomy was sabotaged and shows how mountains of calculations created by academic astronomy and astrophysics are in fact false. They could only parrot these ideas and work on calculations based on these myth and created a huge system of mythematics to pretend an understanding of the Cosmos, when in fact their interpretations are fallacious to the core. None of them has ever had the intellectual capacity to critically think through the many absurd claims and theories which are the foundational premises of modern astro-psyence. It required the dedicated work and critical thinking of a housewife named Pari Spolter to turn astronomy on its head.

The velocity of Io is not due to a gravitational pulling force as is claimed here, it is due to being birthed from Jupiter with its immense rotational velocity and Io has its own center of gravity and moves in its own electrical pressure zone. It is not like a cannon ball falling to Earth as Newton believed! Mass has nothing to do with this, rotational velocity is the cause as it ejects a new born moon, or in the case of the sun a new planet!

The path of planets as they follow the Sun requires greater and greater times to complete a "spiral circumferential trajectory", the further they are from the sun and at the same time the rotations of these planets increase dramatically at these increased distances.)

THIS IS HOW WE WEIGH THE UNIVERSE.

My response:

( The Universe has no weight, all heavenly bodies float weightlessly in space)

For Sun, the numbers work out like this:

The orbit of the Earth is 400 times the size of the orbit of the Moon.

My response:

(The Sun's weight is falsely calculated from this failed logic as applied to the math below)

So, on the right, a-cubed is approximately 65,000,000.

The orbital period of the Earth, however, is only about 13 'months' — about 13 times the orbital period of the Moon. So, on the left, p-squared is only about

170.

## SUN-EARTH SYSTEM

Mass (times) 170 = 65,000,000

Mass of Sun = 333,000 times the mass of Earth

## Part 2

### Natural Philosophy and Physics

Philosophy is “the rational investigation of the truths and principles of being, knowledge, or conduct” (Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary). As such, it covers a wide range of topics, some of which are so esoteric as to be incomprehensible or irrelevant to the average person (e.g., the question of whether or not the observation of things verifies their actual existence and properties, or merely some imaginary construct which leads to their apparent existence and properties). One subset of this range of topics is natural philosophy, which is concerned with the nature of the physical world, and physics, the application of natural philosophy to those parts of the physical world which can be explained by theories which are consistent within themselves, and with each other, and can be tested by experimental means. Note that if a theory cannot be tested by any means, it may be a perfectly acceptable theory philosophically, but it is not a proper theory of physics.

My response:

(So, what does this say about Einstein’s arm chair theories which can not be tested? They are false according to this definition. It is this sort of distinction that is sometimes used to try to separate religion, which is based on faith, rather than experimental proof, and science, which is presumably based on experimental proof, and not faith. Einstein’s and Hawking’s thought experiments are no more valid than religious faith, they are based on faith in his so-called genius which can not and is not based on experimental proof)

However, most scientists It should be noted that the term “theory” means many things to different people. In the ordinary world, saying that something is “only a theory” implies that it is mere speculation, worthy of no serious interest or consideration. In physics, a theory is an exact, specific statement about the way that things work, which is in some way testable by the

application of physical thought and mathematics, and experiment; and most physical theories are so well grounded in experiment and careful comparison with other physical considerations that they are, within the experimental error, as accurate a statement of how things work as any other statement that we can make.

My response:

(Einstein's theories, nuclear theory, quantum and string theories are not in accordance with this definition of theory. )

This does not, unfortunately, mean that all theories are true, and this discussion is centered on three theories of motion in general, and gravity in particular, that have occupied Western thought during the last few millennia. Each of these theories explain the basic experimental observations, but they look at the nature of motion, gravity, and even the space and time we live in, in very different ways.

What Is Gravity?

Gravity is the easily observable phenomenon that things fall, and have weight. If you pick up something, you perceive the "gravitational" effect on it as the weight that presses downward against your effort to lift it. If you let go of it, you perceive the effect as the nearly constant downward acceleration that it experiences, causing it to fall, faster and faster, until it hits the ground, or the air resistance caused by its speed prevents its going any faster. Note that gravity is always downward, and in fact is used to define "down", and the opposite direction, "up". Why things have weight and fall is not known; it is just a fact of nature, which we describe with mathematical statements, and explain with one physical world-view (theory) or another.

My response:

(Russell explains so-called gravity as stillness which centers electric potential of like bodies smaller electric bodies seek rest in larger bodies of greater electric potential!)

At the present time, most people use a theory proposed by Newton, which states (as discussed in more detail below) that gravity is a force exerted by objects on each other, according to their mass and distance from each other. In almost every circumstance known, Newton's Law of Universal Gravitation perfectly explains the gravitational effects and motions we observe.

My response:

(Pari Spolter points out that masses are not needed to explain the law of universal gravitation as is claimed by the astronomy prof. here)

but there are rare circumstances in which his law is not correct, and according to Einsteinian Relativity Theory, gravity is not a force at all, but a condition of space-time a rather an odd amalgam of space and time, which varies according to the motion of the observer, which mimics a force. The exact mathematics and physics of Einsteinian gravity are beyond the comprehension of most people not because they are incapable of understanding the theory, but because they don't have the requisite background in mathematics and physics, but Newton's description is perfectly adequate for all ordinary, every-day purposes. Only certain extreme situations, such as a complete understanding of black holes, and the structure of the Universe, require the use of Einstein's relativity theories, and even then, the basic concepts can be described reasonably well by the use of various analogies.

My response:

(Black holes don't exist, so no need for einy's gravity theory and the structure of the Universe is completely unknown in modern science)

Hellenic (Ancient Greek) Motion and Gravity

Before going into what is right or wrong with Newtonian physics, let's take a look at its predecessor in Western thought, the Hellenic concepts of motion and gravity which were "common sense" knowledge, in the early Renaissance. The basic idea in Hellenic concepts of motion is that everything has a "natural" place, which it will strive to reach, if not in that place, and that if it has reached that place, or is as close to it as is possible, it has a "natural" motion, which is to be at rest.

My response:

(or, in other words everything is seeking rest, but can not find it) Walter Russell

Thus, we observe that rocks which are lying on the ground "prefer" to remain there, as they obviously belong on the ground, being a part of the Earth, which is made of the same stuff they are, and are lying on. But if you pick up a rock, it will resist your effort to remove it from its natural place, and try to return to the ground. We perceive the rock's effort as its weight, and if we let go of it, we see the successful effort it makes, as it falls to its former position. In other words, in this view, weight is the desire of an object to return to the ground, and falling is the natural result of its being allowed to do so.

Of course, not all objects are rocks, or behave like them. Liquids such as water

behave in a fairly similar manner, running downhill until they are at as low a place as possible; but once there, they may jiggle back and forth (e.g., wave motions). And air and fire float around, and rise upward. In Hellenic times, these different behaviors were explained by presuming that different kinds of matter had different properties — and in particular, different natural places and motions — according to the mixture of elements that they were composed of. The elements, as described in this view, are not the same as the elements that we are familiar with today — oxygen, carbon, nitrogen, gold and so on — which differ in terms of their atomic structure; but are based strictly on their natural places and motion, things that can be observed on a large scale, without the aid of modern optical and physical equipment.

My response:

Earth, Air, Water, and Fire all have their own specific electric potentials and all mass in the Universe seeks it's equipotential electric condition to find balance and rest. These elements were sufficient to explain Nature for the Greeks and are grounded in common sense, not arcane mythematics.

The best-known grouping of materials into elements, partly by accident in terms of what ancient texts have survived to this day, and partly by general agreement in the days following its proposal, was set forth by Aristotle, and is the basis of the four materials mentioned above — air, earth, fire and water. Other elemental groupings were proposed by different philosophers, but Aristotle's views are the ones that survived into, and were generally accepted during, the Renaissance.

It might be noted that this description of motion and gravity does not apply to the heavens, whose motions are totally different. All heavenly bodies move across the sky in some combination of uniform circular motions: three for the stars (the daily westward motion around the axis of the sky's rotation, a long-term precession of the Equinoxes which turns out to be caused by a change in the direction of that axis, and a shorter-term nutation, or “nodding” of the axis, relative to its average long-term change), and additional motions for the Sun, moon, and planets.

My response:

(The precession of the equinoxes is an Earth based illusion due to the spiral path of our Solar System and not a result of the inclined axis of the Earth).

Since these objects repeat their motions, over and over, they can't be getting any closer to their natural places, so to speak, and if they were like the materials described by Aristotle, they would cease moving, since they aren't

accomplishing anything by moving.

My response:

(Their very nature is motion as is the nature of the entire Cosmos. The accomplish and fulfill their purpose perfectly, since the Universe is perfect!)

So we presume that they are already in their natural place (the heavens), but unlike the four elemental materials of our experience, their natural motion is not to be at rest, but continually in motion, in some combination of uniform circular motions. This implies that the heavens are made of some material different from the four elements of earthly existence — a fifth element, or “quintessence” (Latin for fifth element), sometimes referred to as the “ether” (ethereal hence coming to mean heavenly, among other things).

My response:

(The astronomer contradicts himself by saying “some combination of uniform circular motions”. Ellipses are not uniform or circular they are elliptical.)

Summary of Hellenic theories of motion and gravity: All things have a natural place. Things made of some combination of the four elements which make up earthly materials seek their natural place when moved from it, but remain at rest if already in it. Things in the heavens, made on a fifth element, are already in their natural place, but have a natural motion consisting of some combination of uniform circular motions.

Gravity consists of the natural effort made by things which belong near the Earth, to return to it. If they are not prevented from doing so, they will fall down; but if they are prevented from doing so, they will exert a downward force on whoever or whatever is preventing them from falling, which we perceive as their weight.

### Newtonian Motion and Gravity

Newton’s description of motion and gravity is completely different from the Hellenic concepts. As a result of Kepler’s supposition that the Earth, like the other planets, moves around the Sun, Galileo’s observations of the heavens, and Galileo’s experiments (real and thought experiments) involving motion, certain concepts had become common sense by Newton’s time, and were summarized by him in his first two laws of motion:

The Law of Inertia (Newton’s First Law of Motion): An object which has no force acting on it will maintain a constant motion. If it is at rest, it will remain at rest. If it is in motion, it will continue in motion, with constant direction and speed.

My response:

(there are no bodies at rest in the Universe and constant direction is impossible since all paths are curved spiral in the Universe)

The Force Law (Newton's Second Law of Motion): An object which has a force acting on it will be accelerated in the direction of the force, by an amount which depends upon the amount of the force, and the inertia of the object, according to the formula

$F = ma$  where  $F$  is the force acting on the object,  $a$  is the acceleration or rate of change of motion of the object resulting from that force, and  $m$  is the mass, or inertia of the object.

It should be noted that the concept of inertia occurs in Hellenic thought, as well, even though not mentioned above; but in Hellenic thought, it represented a different concept — namely, the resistance of an object to any effort to change its position. In Newtonian physics, inertia is the resistance of an object to any effort to change its motion, not its position. Of course, if an object is at rest, changing its position also requires changing its motion, so in that case, the concept of inertia is very similar in both views; but in Newton's physics, it is the change of motion, or acceleration, that requires a force, and a very slow change of position might not require much force, whereas in Hellenic physics, any change of position should require a more or less comparable force.

Newton also enunciated a third law, the Law of Action and Reaction, which states that any action which in his day meant a force results in an equal and opposite reaction. In other words, if you push on something, the force that you use on the object automatically (the action) generates a resisting force (the reaction) which is equal in magnitude, but opposite in direction, and in terms of the object acted upon. Your action pushes another object one way, and its reaction pushes you equally hard, in the opposite direction hence the action and reaction act in opposite directions, on different objects.

My response:

(Reactions do not push back, this is a fallacious argument. There is no action being conducted by a body at rest towards a body which is pushing on it. Pushing is an action, resistance to push is not an action, the two perspectives are not the same one is an action the other is not. This is a logical fallacy)

Note that the effect of the two forces is not necessarily the same, but depends upon the masses, or inertias, of the object. The Earth and Moon are always pulling on each other, with exactly equal and opposite forces the Third Law doesn't say anything about the nature of the action and reaction, so it is

irrelevant to this discussion just what the forces are, but it happens that in this case, they are the gravitational force that is the main topic of this discussion).

My response:

(there is no evidence that the Earth and Moon pull on each other at all. Newton added this false claim to the observation he made on Earth's gravity and its effects on objects close to Earth. There was never any need to add this so-called pulling force to the theory of how gravity works. The Moon has its own center of gravity and is not falling towards Earth as it would need to be to fit this false claim. The pulling effect is an illusion created by electric potential which is unseen. Everything in the Universe seeks its own electric potential. WC Wright proved heavenly bodies actually push on each other with so-called mutual repulsion.)

But although the forces are equal, their effects are not, because the Earth resists a change in motion 81.6 times more than the Moon that is, it has 81.6 times more inertia, or mass, than the Moon. Hence, looking at the Second Law of Motion, with equal forces, but different masses, the Earth will be accelerated its motion will change 81.6 times less than the Moon, causing any motion produced by that acceleration to be 81.6 times smaller than the corresponding motion produced by the acceleration of the Moon.  
(see Gravitational Interactions of the Earth and Moon).

Now, given Newton's way of looking at things, how would he explain gravity? You pick something up, and feel a downward force on you, a reaction to your action, equal to the force you had to exert to pick it up. If you let go of it, it falls to the Earth. Why should it fall? The Law of Inertia says that when you let go of it, it should remain in constant motion, if there is no force on it; and you certainly aren't exerting a force on it, anymore. So why does it fall?

My response:

(because of electric potential, the rock is a dense piece of matter filled with atoms that all have electric potential, they seek rest in the larger body of the Earth, due to its greater electric potential)

Because the Earth, in some way, creates a force which pulls the object downward.

My response:

(once again the false idea of a pulling gravity is introduced into this shell

game, when in fact there is absolutely no evidence at all of a so-called “pulling force of gravity”!)

which we call the force of gravity, and express mathematically by Newton’s Law of Universal Gravitation as

$$F = G m M / r^2$$

where F and m are as before, M is the mass of the Earth, and r is the average distance between the two masses. This force, acting on the object, gives it a downward acceleration, called the acceleration of gravity, which is equal to  $g = F / m = (G m M / r^2) / m = G M / r^2 = \text{a constant, at the surface of the Earth}$

My response:

(there is only one force in the Universe, Electricity. The quacks are trying to explain electrical phenomena using a non-existent pulling force they call gravity and then using equations devised to explain the effects they observe of falling bodies, while falsely claiming there is a force pulling these falling bodies to Earth and projecting that math onto their observation where it is extrapolated ad nauseum to every other event of like nature in the Cosmos!)

Summary of Newtonian theories of motion and gravity: Objects do not have a natural place, but a natural motion, which is to continue moving as they are, unless some force acts on them. If a force acts on them, they are accelerated in the direction of the force, at a rate proportional to the force, and inversely proportional to their mass, or inertia. The weight that we experience when we pick something up is a downward force, exerted by the Earth on the object. As long as we oppose that force, the object can remain suspended and motionless; but if we remove our opposition to the force, it will fall downward, with an acceleration equal to the acceleration of gravity.

My response:

(falling and pulling are two very different things, yet they are both treated as coeval here in this false description)

Contrast between Hellenic and Newtonian theories of gravity: In Hellenic natural philosophy, the weight of an object is its desire to return to the ground; in Newton’s physics, the weight of an object is a “pulling” force which the Earth exerts on the object, compelling it toward the ground.

My response:

(here is where masses and weights are introduced into the shell game and a force is dreamed up to exert a pull on the object, when electrical potential of

two like bodies is the real reason and no pulling force is required to explain the interactions between the two bodies!)

In Hellenic natural philosophy, things fall because they want to return to their natural place, the ground; in Newton's physics, things fall because the force of gravity compels them to do so.

### Einsteinian Motion (Relativity Theory) and Gravity

As noted above, Newton's physics is the common-sensical approach that almost everyone takes in viewing gravity, even today. Things have weight, caused by the Earth's gravitational force on them, and thus they fall, when that force is not opposed.

But quite remarkably, nearly a century ago, Albert Einstein showed that this is "completely" wrong; that gravity is not a force, but a curvature of space-time (admittedly caused by the Earth, in our case) which makes the amount of space between another object and the Earth less in the future, than it is in the present, unless some force opposes the natural tendency of things to move through space along a geodesic — the straightest path possible in that curved space-time, given the velocity of the object

My response:

(Einstein did not "show" anything, he theorized aka "guessed" about space time curvature. So he did not prove Newton wrong at all, he just made up a new bizzare theory and nothing more. The "straightest path possible" is more shell game garble, there are no straight paths, the correct term here is "most direct path", not straightest!)

and the apparent weight of an object is a reaction to the force or action which prevents it from doing that. In other words, when you see something fall, it does so not because the Earth exerts a downward force on it, but because the Earth warps the fabric of space-time in such a way that in the future, the object is closer to the Earth. And when you pick up something, and feel its "weight", you are not feeling the Earth pulling it down, but a reaction to the upward force you are exerting, which is keeping it from falling, the way it is supposed to. Needless to say, this is a very strange way of looking at things,

My response:

(if it is strange then it is a red flag and wrong. Earth does not warp the fabric of space time, for there is no such thing as the fabric of space and time, it is

purely mythological nonsense, has never been proved and requires a religious type of faith in its creator albert einstein.)

and it wouldn't hurt to explain how Einstein came to this conclusion, and why we believe him, strange though the results may appear to be.

My response:

(they believe, because they have faith in einstein's superior intellect, which is quackademic religionism and nothing more. "Strange though the results may appear to be", is a massive red flag that the proposition is false!)

The critical thing to realize, in thinking about gravity, is that it is a very strange force.

(RED FLAG Confirmed again)

Most forces, operating according to Newton's Second Law, produce an acceleration which is equal to  $F / m$ , or the ratio of the force to the object's inertia. Now suppose that you were on a movie lot, in a rocky hilly area, and a scene was to be shot in which the hero was tumbling down a hillside, with large boulders tumbling past him. Obviously, if real boulders were used, our hero might be seriously squashed; so fake boulders are used, which are made to look like the real thing, but have a much lower mass. At the top of the hill, there is a large collection of boulders, real and fake, set up in preparation for the "shoot". Our hero leans against a real boulder, which has a large mass, strongly resists the force he exerts against it, and remains resolutely in place. He is then pushed off the hillside by the villain, who pushes a number of hopefully fake boulders after him. It is easy for the villain to do this, because the fake boulders have hardly any mass, and are easy to move mass being a resistance to a change in motion; but let's suppose that a couple of real boulders are accidentally dislodged, as well off to the side, so that our hero isn't all mused up, anyway. How does gravity know, as it pulls on the fake boulders, which take very little effort to accelerate, that it shouldn't pull on them very hard, and as it pulls on the real boulders, which are hard to accelerate, that it must pull on them very hard, so that even though it is much harder to move the real boulders, they fall in exactly the same way as the fake ones.

My response:

(Gravity has no consciousness to "know" how much to pull, nor does it pull, the shell game once again where the pulling force is added to the observation. All objects fall at the same rate of acceleration, there is no pulling harder on

heavy objects as is claimed in this failed thought experiment. The force of moving these boulders is used in another shell game here where, that force is swapped for the acceleration of gravity. Imagine if the boulders were just dropped from a plane and no force was need to push them off a cliff, they merely fell from the plane, shell game busted!)

In other words, how does gravity manage to always make everything fall at exactly the same rate, regardless of how massive (or not) it is, and regardless of what it is made of?

My response:

(Electric Potential is the reason and all objects obey the same electric laws)

For not only fake and real boulders, but also wood, oil, water, gold, light beams and (if they existed) fairy dust and horsefeathers all fall, under the influence of gravity, in exactly the same way (presuming that we can ignore the effects of air resistance. Gravity is stillness and all masses have electrical potential which is seeking rest in their primary. The mass of something does not affect gravity and this is where Newton failed, He added masses into the gravitational equations when they were not needed. This has caused great confusion amongst gravity researchers. Light has no mass and therefore cannot be added to this false analogy as has been done in this farcical claim above. Nor is light ever bent by gravity, so-called “gravitational lensing”, since the proposition is an absurdity from the get go!)

Of course, the examples of fairy dust and horsefeathers are inserted for humor, such things presumably not existing; but light beams, even though they have no inertia resistance to a change in motion at all — that is, even though they have no mass — fall under the influence of gravity exactly the same as any other object.

My response:

(light does not fall it is an electric process and heavenly bodies have electric potential which acts upon electric light. Nor does the gravity of any heavenly body bend light or cause gravitational lensing. Light is bent by electric and atmospheric lenses. )

My response:

This may be hard to believe, but if you shine a beam of light across a room (in the case of my classes, fifty feet from one side of the room to the other), during the time the beam would take to cross the room (in the case cited, about five thousandths of a millionth of a second) it would fall exactly the same amount as any other object would, during that short time.

My response:

(Newton's Universal law of gravity claims the object must have mass, light is massless, a logical fallacy introduced at this point in their shell game)

So, accepting this rather hard to believe fact

My response:

(RED FLAG)

that everything falls the same, in a given place, as a result of gravity — why does it work out that way? No other force in nature works in this way.

My response:

(Gravity is not a force as is claimed here it is points and shafts of stillness. This is how the shell game is played and fictitious forces are created!)

All other forces act more strongly on some things, and less strongly on others. Is it really possible that gravity doesn't work this way? And if it does, how can we explain it?

My response:

(There is only one force, electricity, strong and weak nuclear forces are myths based on the non-existent nuclear atom and magnetism is planes of stillness (SML), gravity is points and shafts of stillness (SML). Electricity is the sole force in the Universe!)

The first possibility, that different things are acted on differently by gravity, has been carefully tested, over the century or so starting some time before Einstein's theories, and since then. And within the limit of experimental error (which the last I heard, involved about 24 digit accuracy), all things do indeed react to gravity in exactly the same way. But if that's the case, then how can we explain this strange result?

My response:

(All things seek stillness, they do not react to gravity, gravity causes no reactions. This assertion has been utterly obliterated in the many tables of recent data published by Pari Spolter in her book "The Gravitational Force of the Sun"!)

What Einstein proposed, is that the presence of gravity is like being in a rocket ship, which is accelerating upward at one "gee" the acceleration of gravity, and the absence of gravity is like being in an elevator whose cables

have been cut.

My response:

(These are both provably Earth bound motions as examples. Gravity is not remotely the same as the acceleration of a rocket. The Rocket requires a massive amount of force from the fuel it burns. Gravity requires no fuel and it's not a force at all as previously explained!)

In the first case, anything not attached to the ship will appear to fall, as the ship rises, with a motion which is a mirror image of the upward acceleration of the ship. Since the ship has the same motion, regardless of which object we are looking at, the mirror image of its motion is the same for every object. In other words, if the Earth's surface were accelerating upwards, everywhere, at one "gee", we could observe what we do.

My response:

(Mark McCutcheon's theory about universal expansion claims this very thing. However, there is no proof of this at all, it is an extension of this false concept comparing an unnatural rocket propulsion to the stillness which centers all heavenly bodies!)

That isn't possible, of course, as it would make the Earth bigger and bigger; but that doesn't mean that we can't get the same effect, in a different way.

My response:

(This red flag shows us directly the problem of extrapolating false ideas to fit the Cosmos! The Earth is not growing at 9.8 meters per second squared. It would be exponentially larger than it is had it been growing at this rate for the geologically predicted date of 4.5 billion years. If the math were done it would probably be closer to the Genesis account of a 6,000 year old Planet Earth, LOL!)

The other example, being in an elevator which is falling, because its cables have been cut (or jumping off a roof, and observing your resultant motion), is exactly analogous to what happens to an astronaut in orbit.

My response:

(This is not remotely "Exactly analogous"! An astro-not in orbit is floating weightlessly in space, he is not falling, he is accelerating with the illusion of weightlessness, which mimics the astro-not but very poorly. The two motions are unrelated but are swapped here in the academic shell game once again!)

Anything in the falling elevator, you (jumping off the roof), or the astronaut (in orbit around the Earth) would appear to be “weightless”.

My response:

(“Appear to be” is the sophists deception here. The two motions are not the remotely same! The appearances created by the senses are the very foundations of most tragically failed academic theories! This is fake weightlessness caused by the illusions of the senses and not the weightlessness an astro-not experiences in open space.)

That is, you wouldn’t feel any gravitational force acting on you.

My response:

(Pure bullshit, you would feel the fall no matter what, even if your sense of sight was being fooled by the elevator or aircraft which is falling faster than  $9.8 \text{ m sec}^2$ )

And in fact, (in delusion) according to Einstein, that would be absolutely true, because there isn’t any force acting on you. You are falling toward the Earth because it is natural to do so, according to a revised Law of Inertia:

Things which have no force acting on them have constant motion along their space-time geodesic. In the presence of a large mass, like the Earth, that geodesic is curved so as to make things closer together in the future; so things get closer together, or fall, but without any force to make them do so.

A good analogy (shitty analogy) to this would be to imagine people moving northward along parallel lines (BS), such as the meridians of longitude which cross any given parallel of latitude. Each of them is moving exactly parallel (BS) to the others (perpendicular to their common parallel of latitude), so they should never get any closer together; and on a flat Earth, where parallel lines never meet, they wouldn’t get any closer together; but on the real Earth, where all the meridians of longitude come together at the Poles, the individuals would find that they are gradually getting closer together, even though they never move toward each other, at all.

My response:

(Pure Bullshit. The meridians are curved paths which begin converging the moment one leaves the Equator in either direction and are not remotely parallel)

Of course, on the real world, we can measure the shape of the surface, and “see” that the reason for this odd situation (not odd at all) is the curvature of

the surface; but in space-time, you can't see or measure empty space or time

My response:

(time can not be empty this has no meaning at all)

so your only perception is that you get closer and closer together; and in the absence of a true understanding of the situation, you ascribe your movement together as being due to a gravitational force. Now, it is beyond the scope of an introductory astronomy course, even one which considers, however briefly, such topics, to discuss how Einstein arrived at his conclusions in any more detail than this;

My response:

(how convenient that this crap is only partially explained here and done so within the limits of a shell game being played by the shell master)

and as already mentioned, in most cases, it is not necessary to use Einstein's rather odd ideas of space-time and gravity, at all. Newton's concepts of motion and force are perfectly adequate, under all normal circumstances.

My response:

(newton's work used in science mostly, not einy's)

But there are places where this is not true. As we move closer to the Sun and its gravitational influence, the curvature of space-time produces slightly different motions than Newtonian physics predicts; such differences were noted in the 1800's, in the motion of the perihelion of Mercury, and in 1918, in the bending of light rays which pass very close to the Sun, and the differences are exactly as predicted by Einstein's physics, even taking into account the much more accurate measurements of these phenomena possible with current technology.

My response:

(Bullshit, the values claimed by einy were not the same and were not exact and falsely validated in 1918??? The modern confirmation is due to false evidence produce by nasa and Cobe satellite fraud created by Steve Mathers which has been debunked in great detail by Bibhas De on his site "Physics in the Age of Fakery". The process is an electric one, not a gravitational one! Light bends near the sun due to its electric and atmospheric lenses, not due to gravity pulling on it)

Also, when we discuss places where gravity is extremely strong, such as the

“surfaces” of dead stars, such as neutron stars and “black holes”,

My response:

(neither of these two bullshit entities even exists, so any math done on them is monumental bullshit! Gravity is the same everywhere. It is stillness (SML) which centers all heavenly bodies.)

Newton’s physics does not give as accurate results as Einstein’s theories of special and general relativity.

My response:

(That’s because they don’t exist)

And when we discuss the physics of the Universe as a whole, we run into an even stranger situation, for it turns out that Einstein’s physics predicts not one, but three different ways in which space-time can bend, and only one of them corresponds to gravity, as we know it. (RED FLAG!)

When there is a large amount of mass in a given region, Einstein’s theory works as just discussed: the mass curves space-time in a way that makes things closer together in the future than you would expect, if they followed force less Newtonian paths. But just as mass or energy, which is equivalent in Einstein’s physics, or “being”, curves space-time in one way, empty space, or “not-being”, curves space-time in the opposite way. Why empty space should have any effect on the curvature of space-time is beyond any normal description (REDFLAG!),

but it does; and when there are large amounts of empty space between the masses in a region, the tendency of the empty space to curve space-time in the opposite way from the way that the mass wants to curve it can produce a cancellation of the two curvatures, causing the space-time to be “flat”, instead of curved. In such a space, things moving in parallel paths would move unless they got very close to masses in more or less straight lines, never getting any closer or further apart, more or less as we would have expected in the first place.

My response:

(There are no straight paths or flat space in the real Universe anywhere. All Motion is curved and spiral.)

And in fact, the two effects — an apparent gravitational effect, making things

curve toward each other in the vicinity of large masses, and no apparent gravitational effect, allowing things to move in straight-line paths far from large masses, is exactly what we would expect in Newton's physics, given the inverse-square nature of the Law of Gravity. Namely, close to a massive object, where  $r$  is small, the forces are large, and paths curve noticeably; but far from any massive object, things would have essentially zero force acting on them, and move in essentially straight-line paths.

My response:

(Once again a straight path is impossible anywhere in the Universe.)

But as mentioned, there is a third possibility in Einstein's physics, which does not occur in Newton's physics or in Hellenic thought; namely, that if you have enough empty space tens or hundreds of millions of light years of essentially empty space, all that empty space will cause a curvature of space-time which causes things to become further apart, in the future — in a sense, the empty space creates more and more of itself, (LMFAO!)

so that the distances between things grow and grow, without any end. If some object created this effect, we would be tempted to call it anti-gravity; but it is not produced by any object, but by the absence of any significant mass, in a vast region of otherwise empty space; and it's hard to call it anti-gravity, if nothing is creating the effect (or perhaps we should say, the nothingness of empty space is creating the effect).

Einstein himself was puzzled by this result,

(RED FLAG!)

when he was developing his theory of general relativity, because it seemed to imply that (a) if the Universe had a lot more mass than empty space, space-time should curve so that everything would be closer together in the future, than otherwise expected, or (b) if the Universe had a lot more empty space than mass, space-time should curve so that everything would be further apart in the future, than otherwise expected. In the former case, depending upon how extreme the curvature was, the Universe could collapse to a point of zero size analogous to everyone reaching the North Pole, after traveling all the way along their meridians of longitude, at the same time.

My response:

(Utter tripe)

In the latter case, the Universe might expand into infinity, leaving any given place infinitely far from every other place. And at the time he came to this conclusion, neither of these results made any sense, because the Universe as we currently conceive it — a nearly infinite space filled with tens or hundreds of billions of galaxies, each containing hundreds of billions or trillions of stars — was not known to exist.

My response:

(It was known by Bruno and other illuminates, mystics and sages of the East)

All that we knew about was inside a single system, which we now call our Galaxy, or the Milky Way Galaxy, which happens to be a perfectly stable system of stars, orbiting in one way or another under their mutual gravitational attraction, without any reason to expect any significant change in size at any time in the past, present or future. Of course, there is the third possibility, not mentioned in this paragraph, that the Universe happens to have a nearly equal mixture of matter and space, so that things can have stable, “straight-line” paths; but the chances of that happening are so close to zero, that Einstein didn’t consider it significant. Instead, he presumed that he was wrong, and the third kind of space-time curvature couldn’t occur. When, only a decade or so later, Edwin Hubble showed that the Universe is indeed expanding, Einstein declared his failure to make the prediction that empty space could expand the greatest mistake of his life; and as it turns out, not only does empty space expand, but as it does so, there is more and more empty space, so it expands faster and faster any given part of the empty space expands at the same rate as before and afterward, but with more “pieces” of empty space, the overall expansion is faster.

My response:

(This is all red shift based expanding Universe bullshit which has been debunked, so the authors claims are unintelligent and ill informed)

But for now, we ignore such considerations, as they belong not in a discussion of the basic nature of motion and gravity, but in a discussion of the Expansion of the Universe. Instead, we summarize the three ways of looking at things, one last time, in case this (undoubtedly overlong) discussion has led you to forget them.

Summary of the three theories of gravity presented here: In Hellenic theory,

things fall because they want to; in Newtonian physics, they fall because the Earth creates a force of gravity which pulls them downward; and in Einstein's relativity theory, they fall because the Earth curves the fabric of space-time so that in the future, things are closer together than now.

Similarly, in Hellenic theory, the weight of an object is a measure of its desire to return to the Earth; in Newtonian physics, the weight is the downward force of the Earth's gravity; and in Einstein's relativity theory, the weight is a reaction force created by our action, in preventing the object from falling, the way it was supposed to, in the first place.

### Final Thoughts

So when we have three theories of gravity, like this, how are we to choose between them? Why do we prefer one over the others? Because careful experimentation says we have to. The Hellenic ideas do not work, if we realize that the Earth is not stationary, as once thought, but moves around the Sun, just like the other planets, according to the Laws of Planetary Motion discovered by Kepler. Under these circumstances, the basic concepts of motion involved in Hellenic physics are blown to bits, and theories of gravity based on them must be discarded. Similarly, Newton's physics works perfectly well under most circumstances, but in some circumstances, it makes incorrect predictions about the nature of motion (BECAUSE THOSE THINGS DO NOT EXIST!), while Einstein's theory of relativity provides a consistent, logical (ILLOGICAL)

albeit very strange (RED FLAG) way of looking at things which makes predictions about the motions of things that are absolutely accurate(BULLSHIT) , to the limit of current experimental technology.

Fortunately, the circumstances in which Einstein's predictions are better than Newton's are so far removed from ordinary experience that we can normally ignore the truth, and pretend that things fall because the Earth exerts a force on them; but that is not true.

My response:

(But the following bullshit is true?)

Things fall because the Earth curves the fabric of space-time, and moving without any force acting on them, they follow what we perceive as curved paths, even though, following the Law of Inertia, they are moving in the straightest possible paths through that space-time fabric.

My response:

("Curved paths" are the norm, curved space-time gravity is unnecessary being that helical trajectories are the normal path for all heavenly bodies. "Straight paths" do not exist in the real Universe of curved electrical pressure gradients. The "Space time" myth is a fabrication not worthy of any consideration what so ever! None of my remarks, line by line through any of these works is ever allowed in psyence. One is never given the opportunity to breakdown the logical fallacies, misrepresentations, diversions, frauds and shell games as they are being force fed to naïve students who believe their instructors are authorities and have worked through all of the myths and proved them to be true, when in fact as I have show they are far from it!)

And of course, there is always the possibility that some day, we will find deviations between the predictions of Einstein's theories, and the observed motions of things.

My response:

(they have already been found, even from the time einy first was debunked on the bending of starlight at eclipse, the academic community has censored out all info which conflicts with their Zionist idol, einy! COBE satellite is the latest falsification!)

There are, in fact, a number of experiments that have been proposed which may yield such deviations, and if so, and if we cannot find a way to explain them using Einstein's physics, we may be forced to abandon that, and accept some still stranger theory

(RED FLAG)

of gravity, space and time; but to date, every experiment ever carried out has confirmed the accuracy of Einstein's physics,

My response:

( LYING BULLSHIT TO THE CORE)

and it is very unlikely that any reason will be found to abandon it, any time soon.

My response:

(Meaning his job is safe and secure as long as the myth continues on!)  
Still, a century ago, physicists were quite confident that very little remained to be discovered in physics, and since then, relativity theory and quantum mechanics have completely changed our concepts of reality at the very largest and very smallest scales;

My response:

(QM and relativity are both false and have not changed the concepts they have derailed the study of Cosmology and sent it into a dead end where it can go nowhere else!)

so who can say that any day now, new experiments won't overturn our current theories of gravity and motion?

My response:

(it has already been done, but academics like selligman are never aware of these truths since the evidence is never allowed to appear before them in their rigged peer review mind control agenda. These folks are not informed they are living in a box, which rejects anything which will not fit in that box)

### **Part 3**

DB LARSON on Scalar Motions:

Scalar motion: I lifted this before the link expired. Thank Wiki!!!

From RST Wiki, the Reciprocal System of Theory encyclopedia.

Scalar motion is a term coined by Dewey B. Larson, author of *The Structure of the Physical Universe* (North Pacific Publishers, 1959). In this work, later revised and published in three volumes, Larson developed the world's first general physical theory based on his discovery of scalar motion. This theory, called the Reciprocal System of Physical Theory(RST), posits that all matter and energy, in fact, the entire universe, consists of nothing but motion, which is the title of volume one of his work, *Nothing But Motion*. Volumes two and three, *Basic Properties of Matter* and *The Universe of Motion*, respectively, treat the consequences of the theory in the realm of the microcosmic world of

matter and the macrocosmic arena of cosmology and astrophysics.

The RST is unique because it is a general system of theory that inaugurates a new program of physics, a program based on classifying physical phenomena on the basis of a system of fundamental motions, which differs dramatically from the current program of the legacy system of physical theory (LST), or legacy physics, that is based on classifying physical phenomena on the basis of a system of forces. Eventually the world must recognize, sooner or later, that scalar motion does indeed exist, and that it plays a crucial role in the phenomena of nature. Larson's book, *The Neglected Facts of Science*, (North Pacific Publishers, 1982) reports his findings concerning scalar motion based solely on observations without regard to any theoretical considerations.

## Table of contents

- 1 Scalar Motion – An Unrecognized Type of Motion
- 2 The Force of Scalar Motion
- 3 The Dimensions of Scalar Motion
- 4 Fundamental Motions

## Scalar Motion – An Unrecognized Type of Motion

In *The Neglected Facts of Science*, Larson reviews current ideas of space, time and motion and contrasts these with established facts and observations. For instance, he points out that science has not considered the importance of the differences between scalar motion and vectorial motion even though he shows that it is crucial to understanding motion in general. Unlike ordinary vectorial motion, which is defined by both direction and magnitude, called a vector, scalar motion has no direction, but only magnitude. He explains the difference in the first chapter of his book using the analogy of an expanding balloon and plastic ball:

The type of motion with which we are familiar in everyday life is vectorial.

This is motion relative to a fixed reference system. Like scalar motion, it has a magnitude, but it also has a direction in the reference system, and the effect of the motion depends on this direction, as well as on the magnitude of the motion. The difference between the two types of motion can be brought out clearly by consideration of a simple example. Let us assume that a moving point X is located between two points Y and Z on the straight line joining the two points. If the motion of X is vectorial, and in the direction XY, then the distance XY decreases and the distance XZ increases. But if the motion of X is scalar, as on the surface of the expanding balloon, or in the expanding plastic ball, both XY and XZ increase. (The Neglected Facts of Science (NFS), Chapter 1)

Though the implications of this difference in the two types of motion aren't immediately apparent, Larson goes on to show that one can conclude that some profound consequences follow as a result. The first thing that he establishes is that, unlike ordinary vectorial motion, scalar motion can be distributed over all directions. This so-called distributed scalar motion is then shown to have some peculiar characteristics when viewed from our ordinary, spatial reference system of physical coordinates, the familiar x, y and z reference frame of ordinary experience.

For instance, scalar motion can appear to change direction or even alternate directions, when coupled with a reference point in the reference system that gives it direction that it does not inherently possess. Consequently, says Larson, 'Current science...does not recognize it as a motion.' This is an important point because, if these motions are not recognized as motions, it would be difficult if not impossible to understand their true nature. However, the existence of scalar motion, having magnitude only and no inherent direction in coordinate space, is an observable fact, says Larson:

Here, then, is one of the hitherto unrecognized facts that are being brought to light by this work, the existence of a type of motion that is quite different from the vectorial motions with which we are familiar. This is a fact that is undeniable. We can observe this different type of motion directly in phenomena such as the expanding balloons, and we can detect it by means of measurements of radiation frequencies in the case of the receding galaxies. As can easily be seen, this motion has no property other than magnitude; that is, it is a scalar motion.

#### The Force of Scalar Motion

The question that immediately comes to mind though is, 'If this motion is so important, why hasn't science recognized it as such?' Larson acknowledges this and sees it as understandable given the circumstances. Nevertheless, he

believes there are some important conclusions to be made:

The status of scalar motion as a type of motion distinct from ordinary vectorial motion has not heretofore been recognized because the known phenomena involving such motion have not appeared to be of any appreciable consequence, and no one has undertaken to examine them critically. After all, there is not much interest in the physics of expanding balloons. But once it has been established that scalar motion is a distinct type of motion that can be originated by deliberate human action, it becomes evident that production of this type of motion by natural means is not only a possibility, but a definite probability. Indeed, we have already identified one naturally occurring motion of this kind, the galactic recession, and we are entitled to conclude that other natural scalar motions probably exist somewhere in the universe. Since no such motions are known at present, it follows that if they do exist, they are not currently recognized as motions. This further suggests that there must be some serious error in the current beliefs as to the nature of the phenomena in which these scalar motions are involved.

One of these 'serious errors in the current beliefs' that Larson refers to concerns the concept of force. Larson points out how science has strayed from its definition because 'In the absence of an understanding of the nature and properties of distributed scalar motion...it has not been possible to reconcile what is known about the "fundamental forces" with the requirements of the definition of force, and as a result this definition has become one of the disregarded features of physics, so far as its application to the origin of the forces is concerned.' He goes on to explain:

As soon as this issue is raised, it is practically obvious that the difficulty originates in the present attitude toward the concept of force. For application in physics, force is defined by Newton's Second Law of Motion. It is the product of mass and acceleration,  $F = ma$ . Motion, the relation of space to time, is measured on an individual mass unit basis as speed, or velocity,  $v$ , (that is, each unit moves at this speed) or on a collective basis as momentum, the product of mass and velocity,  $mv$ , formerly called by the more descriptive name "quantity of motion." The time rate of change of the magnitude of this motion is then  $dv/dt$  (acceleration,  $a$ ) in the case of the individual unit, and  $m dv/dt$  (force,  $ma$ ) when measured collectively. Thus force is, in effect, defined as the rate of change of the magnitude of the total motion. It can legitimately be called "quantity of acceleration,"...It follows from the definition that force is a property of a motion; it is not something that can exist as an autonomous entity. It has the same standing as any other property. The so-called "fundamental forces of nature," the presumably autonomous forces that are currently being called upon to explain the origin of the basic physical phenomena, are necessarily properties of underlying motions; they cannot

exist as independent entities. Every “fundamental force” must originate from a fundamental motion. This is a logical requirement of the definition of force, and it is true regardless of the physical theory in whose context the situation is viewed.

It's easy to see why Larson's ideas are so controversial. Nothing is more sacrosanct in physics as the concept of the ‘forces of nature,’ especially the so-called ‘fundamental forces,’ but Larson is saying that they have not been seen in their true light:

It can be concluded that the so-called “fundamental forces” are the force aspects of the hitherto unrecognized scalar motions...The distributed scalar motions have not been seen in their true light because “motion” has been taken to be synonymous with “vectorial motion,” and phenomena such as gravitation that are effective in many, or all directions, and therefore have no specific vectorial direction, are clearly not vectorial motions.

This conclusion is tantamount to saying that modern physics has it wrong; That they have invented concepts that are inconsistent with their own definitions because they could see no alternative. Larson calls them to task for this saying that such a procedure is illegitimate:

The concept of autonomous forces has therefore been invoked to provide an alternative [to motion produced force]. [However], it is not a legitimate alternative, since force is defined as a property of motion. This leaves present-day physical science in a dilemma, because it cannot identify the motions that the definition requires. An electric charge, for instance, produces an electric force, but so far as can be determined from observation, it does so directly. There is no indication of any intervening motion. This situation is currently being handled by ignoring the requirements of the definition of force, and treating the electric force as an autonomous entity generated in some unspecified way by the charge.

However, armed with his discovery of distributed scalar motion, Larson now offers a way out of the unfortunate predicament that science has gotten itself into, since he is able to identify the true nature of such forces such as the electric charge for the first time in history:

The need for an evasion of this kind is now eliminated by the clarification of the nature of scalar motion, which shows that the characteristics of rotationally distributed scalar motion are the very ones that are required in order to exert forces of the kind that are now erroneously regarded as autonomous. It is now evident that the reason for the lack of any evidence of a motion intervening between the electric charge and the electric force is that

the charge itself is the motion. It is the distributed scalar motion of which the electric force is a property.

Such a declaration, that the electric charge has been identified as a motion, were it to be taken seriously by the scientific community, would make world-wide headlines. This is because the nature and origin of the electrical charge is one of those “unknowables” of physics, an unexplainable constant of nature. However, Larson doesn’t stop there. He goes on to identify other “forces” of nature as distributed scalar motions such as magnetic force, gravitational force, and the opposing force of gravity responsible for the expansion of the universe as well. However astounding these claims may seem to be, insists Larson, they are not based on ad hoc theoretical assumptions or hypotheses. They are, in fact, based solely on observational facts:

Inasmuch as...this [book] is purely factual, it does not offer any new inductive theories to replace the inventive theories currently in vogue. It merely calls attention to a large number of hitherto undiscovered, unrecognized, or disregarded physical facts, all of which the theories of physics, inventive or inductive, as the case may be, will hereafter have to be prepared to deal with. From now on, the requirements for acceptance of theories will be substantially enlarged. No theory will be viable unless it incorporates an acceptable explanation of scalar motion and its consequences.

#### The Dimensions of Scalar Motion

In his analysis of observed scalar motion, Larson concludes that its magnitudes must be three-dimensional since it exists in a three-dimensional universe, that is, it takes three magnitudes to completely define it. He writes:

From a mathematical standpoint, an n-dimensional quantity is merely one that requires n magnitudes for a complete definition. As one dictionary explains, by way of illustration, “ $a^2 - b^2 - c$  is a term of five dimensions.” A scalar motion in one dimension is defined in terms of one magnitude; a scalar motion in three dimensions is defined in terms of three magnitudes.

However, it is clear that only one of these three magnitudes can be represented in the conventional reference system of spatial coordinates as a vectorial motion because it takes three dimensions of space to represent the direction of one dimension of motion. However, in spite of this, since scalar motion has magnitude only, all three of its magnitudes can be accommodated by the universe.

It’s important to realize that this limitation of the reference system is a serious deficiency that distorts the physical picture and creates difficulties for physicists trying to compensate for it unawares. Larson observes:

Since the conventional reference system cannot represent all of the

distributed scalar motions, and present-day science does not recognize the existence of any motions that cannot be represented in that system, it has been necessary for the theorists to make some arbitrary assumptions as a means of compensating for the distortion of the physical picture due to this deficiency of the reference system. [Basic Properties of Matter, Chapter 12]

One of these assumptions is the assumption of the existence of forces without identifying the required antecedent motion as discussed above. This has led to many difficulties. However, another consequence of this limitation of the reference system that is on the other-side-of-the-coin so to speak is that there exist two dimensions of motion that cannot be represented in it.

This discovery changes the physical picture in a dramatic fashion. As long as motion is viewed only as a one-dimensional change of position in a 3D spatial coordinate frame, only such motion can exist. However, as soon as it is recognized that motion can exist that has magnitude only, it is readily apparent that there can be motion in all three dimensions in a three-dimensional universe. Albeit, these three dimensions of scalar motion must now be distinguished from the geometrical dimensions represented by the reference system, as they are properly mathematical dimensions, their existence is real and therefore their properties such as force are manifest in physical phenomena.

## Fundamental Motions

Larson is able to identify physical phenomena related to rotationally distributed scalar motions in all three of these dimensions in various combinations; that is, he finds that physical properties of matter, on both a micro and a macro level, can be explained as a result of combinations of three-dimensional scalar motions, two-dimensional scalar motions, and one-dimensional scalar motions. One-dimensional, rotational, scalar motion, or electrical motion, is identified with electrical phenomena, two-dimensional, rotational, scalar motion, or magnetic motion, is identified with magnetic phenomena, and three-dimensional, a combination of one-dimensional and two-dimensional scalar motion, or gravitational motion, is identified with gravitational phenomena.

The similarity between the classification of these motions as “fundamental” and the designation of the “fundamental forces” of quantum mechanics is not incidental. Nevertheless, as discussed above, Larson insists that force is a

property of motion, and, therefore, any force measured in nature must be associated with a corresponding motion. However, since the RST rejects the nuclear concept of the atom, based on “fundamental forces,” the manner in which these forces interact to produce the properties of matter is quite distinct from the way it works in current theories. Larson stresses the importance of understanding that in the RST every ‘entity or phenomenon that exists in this universe is either a motion, a combination of motions, or a relation between motions.’

This means that the fundamental properties and interactions of matter, such as energy, velocity, gravity, mass, inertia, momentum, acceleration, density, pressure, work, power, viscosity, torque, etc. must reduce to terms of motion, which by definition is a ratio of units of space and time. In Larson’s words:

Inasmuch as motion in general is defined as a relation between space and time, expressed symbolically by  $s/t$ , all of the different kinds of motions, and the relations between motions, can be expressed in space-time terms.

In the first volume of *The Structure of the Physical Universe*, entitled *Nothing But Motion*, Larson introduces the theoretical investigation and development of a universe of scalar motion. He begins this development on the assumption that space and time are the reciprocal aspects of motion, and he follows the logical consequences of this assumption until he is able to analyze the mechanical system of classical physics in terms of nothing but motion. Later, this work is extended, in volumes II and III, to the regimes of the very small, the very large, and the very fast, which, as he demonstrates, can also be understood in terms of scalar motion.

- See more at: <http://www.feandft.com> (FreeEnergyAndFreeThinking)